



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

VI.—ON DIRECT SPEECH INTRODUCED BY A CONJUNCTION.

There can hardly be a doubt that in reporting speech or thought, all languages at first made use of the direct method, putting the actual words of the speech or thought after the verb of saying or thinking, without a connecting word ; in other words, the first construction in such sentences was that of parataxis. In most languages, however, we find from the earliest times indirect methods employed as well, methods adapted to the point of view of the narrator, and of these we notice two distinct forms: that of the case of the direct object (accusative) with the infinitive mood, and that of a finite mood introduced by some relative or demonstrative word which has become a conjunction. The former is a Graeco-Latin construction, found nowhere else as a regular and distinct construction; for although we occasionally find the germs of such a use in other languages as well, it has not become fixed there as such, and infinitives of this kind are generally felt as dependent. In Latin this is for the classic period the only form of *oratio obliqua*. In Greek, which has both forms, it is apparently the older; with verbs of saying it is in Homer still the prevailing construction. This form of indirect speech is altogether peculiar, as it incorporates into the principal clause, as part of it, the leading verb of the *or. obliqua*. Thus it removes everything far from its original appearance in *or. recta*, and is apt to produce, especially if long kept up, a feeling of heaviness which is best observed by reading the long-sustained examples of the Latin, and which is much worse than the natural awkwardness arising from the long-continued use of even the other construction. It could not, therefore, hope eventually to survive. The more accurate use of a conjunction with a finite mood gradually crowded it out in both Greek and Latin, and in their modern descendants it no longer exists.

The latter use is the one generally found. Here a finite mood is introduced by a conjunction which was originally a demonstrative pronoun, as is the case in the Germanic languages, where, however, this demonstrative serves as a relative also, or has become a

relative, or else either by a relative pronoun or a relative adverb of manner. The Greek language possesses both the latter in its use of *ὅτι* (*ō*) and *ὥς*. Similarly the Sanskrit uses both *yad* = *ō*, the relative pronoun, and *yathā* = *ōs*, a relative adverb. Other languages use only the pronoun, as *quod* in Latin (late), and *que* in the Romance languages. So the Hebrew uses *אשר*, its relative pronoun; *אֲשֶׁר* was originally a demonstrative in form, but is a relative in its use. Sometimes we find the people using a relative adverb where the literary language does not allow its employment.

If the use of *or. obliqua* gains the point of giving the speech or thought from the position of the narrator, it also loses much in vividness and accuracy, so that we find the direct method always kept up in all languages, and indeed it becomes almost necessary when the speeches are long or many are to be reported. Now, in spite of the fact that it already had all the forms of indirect narration found anywhere, in addition to the direct, the Greek language added another form of narration to its existing stock, one which is neither direct nor indirect, but mediates between the two, giving the actual words, but having the appearance of hypotaxis in being introduced by the conjunction *ὅτι* or *ὥς*. The effect is in the main that of direct quotation, and yet there is a very important difference: the word *ὅτι* prepares the mind for some speech that is to come, and thus serves, as it were, as spoken quotation marks, just as *ἴρα*, *ἄλλο τι ἦ*, etc., show that a question is to follow, and many of the troublesome particles are signs of stress of voice that must be inferred in other languages. Just how soon this use came into the language it is not easy to say. To literature it is not known before Herodotus. We find it in II 115 *λόγον ἐκφαίνει ὁ Πρωτεύς, λέγων ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰ μὴ περὶ πολλοῦ ἡγεόμην . . . ἐγὼ ἂν σε . . . ἐτίσάμην*, and probably only there in that author, as apparently no other example has been noticed in his work. The fact that we first meet this use in Herodotus does not by any means prove that it entered the language at that period or but little before that time, for it could have been a construction used by the people long before and yet not have appeared in literature, especially as that literature had been mostly poetical; nor does the fact that he uses it so little prove anything as to the frequency of its use at that time; soon after it is met with more frequently, but then the use of prose began to grow more extended, and this construction does not leave the sphere of prose.

In this form of quotation it will at once be evident that where

forms of the third person are employed the use may be either direct or indirect, *e. g.* λέγει ὅτι ὁ ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς ἐστίν may be, he says that the man is good, or, he says: "the man is good." In most of these cases, however, it would seem that even when the construction was quite well known the feeling must have been that of indirect quotation, as the latter was very much more common and almost necessarily the one to come up in the mind first. We can, therefore, never speak with certainty of a quotation with ὅτι as direct which contains only forms of the third person, unless some interjection or particle is used which could not remain in oratio obliqua. Sentences containing forms of the first or second person, it will be seen at once, may or may not be quotations according to the conditions of the case. As to the range and even the frequency of this construction, most grammars leave us at least partly in doubt: the number of examples given by them varies between two and twelve, and all are taken from Thucydides, Xenophon, Plato, and Herodotus. The first three are exceptional writers and the last is Ionic.

The first fact we notice in connection with this use is that it is limited to prose; if any examples could be found in poetry they would surely be sporadic. In prose, however, we find it in history, in philosophy and in oratory; in other words, in prose of every kind, without occurring very frequently anywhere. I myself have observed especially the use in the Attic orators except Hyperides and the fragments. Only such cases, of course, were noticed as cannot be indirect. Of the orators, Antiphon the first, Isaeus and Lysurgus show no examples; Andocides, however, the second in the canon, follows Antiphon with four, and all in his great speech on the mysteries: I 49, 63, 120, 135. This is relatively a large number, and as we have the word of Dionysius of Halicarnassus that Andocides represents the language of the gentleman of the period, we may infer that the use was even then at least familiar in ordinary conversation. Lysias has but one case, that, however, in familiar language: I 26, ἐγὼ δὲ εἶπον ὅτι οὐκ ἐγὼ σε ἀποκτενῶ κτέ. Isocrates too shows one example in 12, 215. In Aeschines we observe five, 1, 147; 2, 28, 50; 3, 22, 120. It is in Demosthenes, naturally, that we find most, and they occur mostly in the public speeches. We find examples in Or. 7, 8, 18, 19, 21, 23, 47, 49, 50, 59. This might at first seem to show that it was not a construction of familiar language, as we should expect it oftener in direct quotations occurring in the private speeches. But it would be

unfair to judge so, for a number do occur in easy familiar talk, as 47, 57 ἀπαγορευούσης τῆς γυναίκος μὴ ἄπτεσθαι αὐτοῖς καὶ λεγούσης ὅτι αὐτῆς εἴη ἐν τῇ προικί τετιμημένα καὶ ὅτι τὰ πρόβατα ἔχετε πεντήκοιτα καὶ τὸν παῖδα κτέ. and again there may not be so great a need for its use in these speeches. The examples I have noticed are 7, 20; 8, 31; 18, 40, 174; 19, 22, 40, 242, 253; 21, 200 (49 and 103 look very much like direct, but can be indirect as well); 23, 106; 47, 57; 49, 63; 50, 49; 59, 110; 19, 168 is proved to be a case by the use of the conjunction ἀλλά: οὕτε κατεπιείν τούτων εἶχε καλῶς οὕτε εἰπείν ὅτι "ἀλλ' ἔχουσιν ὁ δέϊνα καὶ ὁ δέϊνα."¹

For this construction we have seen ὅτι is prevalently the conjunction used, so much so that the use of ὥς has altogether escaped some grammarians; of all those I noticed, Kühner alone adds the words (selten ὥς), while Krüger in a rather dogmatic way adds 'nie ὥς,' but even Kühner gives no examples, unless we take the change of construction in Anab. 1. 3, 16 ἐνδεικνὺς ὥς εὐθὺς εἴη ἡγεμόνα αἰτεῖν παρὰ τούτου ᾧ λυμαίνόμεθα τὴν πρᾶξιν, where the feeling is quite different from that of direct introduction by the conjunction. The word ὥς does, indeed, rarely introduce direct discourse; there are in the orators two cases in Dinarchus, and, which is a matter of some interest, the only two in that author, and one probable case in Demosthenes. Those in Dinarchus are 1, 12 χρήσεται λόγοις ἐξαπατῶν ὑμᾶς ὥς ἐγὼ Θηβαίους ὑμῖν ἐποίησα συμμάχους, and 1, 102 ἐνταῦθα φήσεται εἶναι δεινοὶ εἰ παρακρούσεσθε τούτους λέγοντες ὥς οὐκ ἔστιν ἕξω τῆς πατρίδος ἡμῖν ἐξελθεῖν, and Dem. 21, 151 ἐπὶ ταῦτα δ' ἀπήντων ὥς ἡλωκεν ἤδη καὶ κατεψήφισται τίνος τιμήσειν . . . προσδοκᾶς. The third example is not certain, as it may very easily be, and possibly is to be regarded as a change of construction. Besides these cases I have observed ὥς so used once in Plut. Them. c. ii εἰώθει λέγειν ὥς οὐδὲν ἔσθι ᾧ παῖ σὺ μικρόν . . . κτέ. It may occur more frequently in later Greek.

Of other writers, ὅτι is used in this way by Plato not unfrequently in his dialogues, so in Protag. 317 E, 339 B, 346 C, 361 A; Symp. 172 C, 189 A, 190 C; Phaedr. 268 A; Crito 50 C, etc. Ast gives those underlined and also the cases Gorg. 521 A, Crat. 431 A, where no verb is used and the construction is just as likely to be regarded as indirect. Ast adds the words *sesc. al.* to his list, but

¹ In 49, 37 we have a case of change from indirect to direct, but differing from 47, 57 in not having ὅτι repeated before the direct speech, so that it does not fall under the head we are now treating, as the feeling is very different, and the construction is very different from immediate introduction by ὅτι.

if he means a very large number by that, a close count will, I am sure, convince one that he is wrong. Xenophon, too, uses it comparatively speaking frequently, as in *Anab.* 1. 6, 8; 2. 4, 16; 5. 4, 10; 7. 2, 13; *Hell.* 1. 5, 6; 3. 3, 7, etc.; *Cyr.* 3. 1, 8 (4. 2, 18 and 3, 20 not certain); 7. 3, 1, ἀπεκρίνατο ὅτι ὁ δῖος ποταμὸς οὐ ζῆν is explained by some as a causal use of ὅτι, but it seems more natural to refer it to the use we are now considering. Thucydides uses it a few times, 1. 137, 4; 5. 10, 5 and 8. 53, 3, and this, probably, is the extent of the use in that strange writer. 1. 139, 3, λεγόντων ἄλλο μὲν οὐδὲν . . . αὐτὰ δὲ τάδε ὅτι Λακεδαιμόνιοι βούλονται τὴν εἰρήνην εἶναι, εἴη δ' ἂν εἰ ἀφεῖτε, may be direct, or an example of change from indirect to direct. Aristophanes does not use the construction, unless we class as such the two cases:

Eq. 337 εἰν δὲ μὴ ταύτῃ γ' ὑπέεικε λέγει ὅτι καὶ πονηρῶν.

Plut. 1001-2 . . . εἶπεν ἀποπέμπτων ὅτι

πάσαι ποτ' ἦσαν ἄλκιμοι Μιλήσιοι,

of which the former is evidently indirect with verb omitted, the latter must remain doubtful and is probably indirect. Later we find the construction still used, *e. g.* in the narrative parts of the *N. T.*, as *Matth.* 4, 6; *Mark* 5, 35; *Luke* 4, 21; 8, 49; *John* 10, 36; *Acts* 23, 20; 25, 8, et al.

In reporting speech, and even thought, the Eastern languages always show a decided preference for the more accurate and, at the same time, life-like way of parataxis, *i. e.* for the use of direct speech. Especially is this true of *Skt.*, where such speech or thought is marked generally at the end by the word *iti*. This little word even points to the actual words of a thought without having the verb of thinking itself expressed. In view of this fondness for the more vivid method of direct narration, it is not to be wondered at that the language not only very largely avoided the indirect construction, but even kept the direct speech even when the signs of indirect discourse were there. Both *yathā* and *yad* are used in this way, though *yathā*, unlike the Greek *ὥς*, is used as often as, it seems, nay even oftener than *yad*.

Unlike the Greek, too, the *Skt.* proves by the use of *iti*, which always points to the actual words of a speech or thought, that quotations may be unquestionably direct even there where the direct and indirect forms agree. Where *iti* is not used we may be in doubt, and yet there is good reason to believe *M. Williams*, in his dictionary, when he calls all such examples direct, *e. g.* *jñāyate yathā rāja tat kariṣyati*, 'it is known that the king will do this.'

If we take the Greek: γνώριμόν ἐστιν ὅτι ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦτο ποιήσει, no one will question the fact that this is indirect, as in Greek the construction is limited to verbs of saying, and hardly any would be in doubt about λέγει ὅτι ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦτο ποιήσει; in Skt., on the other hand, owing to the tendency to use or. recta, we may always believe the reverse. In this point this language presents a marked difference from the Greek. Just how frequently *yathā* or *yad* introduces oratio recta marked by *iti* I am not able to say; it is certainly not an isolated phenomenon, and yet there was no need for its frequent use, as the language could do as well with *iti* alone, and in the great majority of cases it is satisfied with the latter. By the use of both the conjunction and the word *iti* at the end Skt. marks the speech at both ends, where the Greek only shows at the beginning by ὅτι that a speech is to follow. Hebrew also presents a similar phenomenon with אֲשֶׁר and כִּי, but its use does not appear to be very extensive.

In Europe it would seem the Greek stands alone. Latin tried it, so, too, Gothic (cf. Mark 5, 35 et al.), but these are evident imitations; there seems to have been no independent growth or even generally adopted use of this construction in either of these or in any of the Romance or Germanic languages (cf. Diez, Gr. der Rom. Spr., Vol. III, p. 334 note). True we have apparent examples, as French 'que oui,' 'que non,' after verbs of saying, which cannot so well be explained as indirect as Greek ὅτι οὐ, but such cases do make it a French construction.

On the whole, the construction is not a very widely spread one, appearing to some extent in Asia, and in Europe, in that most versatile of all languages, the Greek. The latter limits the use to verbs of saying, using it in a few cases with such verbs as γράφειν, δηλοῦν, etc., as Dem. 19, 40 γράψας ἐπιστολὴν ὅτι; the Skt. extends it with perfect freedom by the use of the word *iti* to verbs of mental action as well. Nowhere is it largely used. There seems to be no reason for doubting that it grew up on Greek soil. How soon it first appeared is a difficult question to answer. It does not occur in Homer or any of the elegiac, lyric and iambic poets of the 7th and 6th centuries, and yet, as once said, it is not safe to draw conclusions too certainly from such facts, the construction may have remained below the surface in poetic literature during this time, though used in conversation. That it was conversational is evident, and yet Aristophanes does not use it; this, however, only proves, if anything, that its use was not very frequent. It

can hardly be said to have been in its infancy in Herodotus, or else it grew very rapidly, for it is used soon after by Thucydides, Andocides, Lysias and Plato with apparent ease. It is more likely one of the productions of the centuries preceding this period, when the language was putting forth every effort, making every experiment for the accurate and nice expression of thought.

EDWARD H. SPIEKER.